**Operative Performance Rating System (OPRS)**

**SMALL BOWEL RESECTION – COLECTOMY**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluator:** |  | **Resident:** |  |
| **Resident Level:**  |  | **Program:**  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date of Procedure:** |  | **Time Procedure Was Completed:** |  |
| **Date Assessment Was Completed:** |  | **Time Assessment Was Initiated:** |  |

 |

Please rate this resident's performance during this operative procedure. For most criteria, the caption above each checkbox provides descriptive anchors for 3 of the 5 points on the rating scale. "NA" (not applicable) should only be selected when the resident did not perform that part of the procedure.

**Case Difficulty**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Straightforward anatomy, no related prior surgeries or treatment | Intermediate difficulty | Abnormal anatomy, extensive pathology, related prior surgeries or treatment (for example radiation), or obesity |
|[ ] [ ] [ ]

**Degree of Prompting or Direction**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Minimal direction by attending. Resident performs all steps and directs the surgical team independently with minimum or no direction from the attending, to either the resident or to the surgical team. | Some direction by attending. Resident performs all steps but the attending provides occasional direction to the resident and /or to the surgical team. | Substantial direction by attending. Resident performs all steps but the attending provides constant direction to the resident and surgical team. |
|[ ] [ ] [ ]

**Procedure-Specific Criteria**

**Abdominal Exploration**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5Excellent | 4Very Good | 3Good | 2Fair | 1Poor | NA |
| Performed complete, efficient and systematic abdominal exploration |  | Performed complete abdominal exploration but somewhat disorganized |  | Performed disorganized and incomplete abdominal exploration |  |
| [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |

**Use of Stapling Devices (stapled anastomosis)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5Excellent | 4Very Good | 3Good | 2Fair | 1Poor | NA |
| Excellent understanding of stapling devices, appropriate, efficient use |  | Understanding of stapling devices, less than efficient use |  | Poor knowledge, inefficient use of device |  |
| [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |

**Suture Placement (hand sewn anastomosis)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5Excellent | 4Very Good | 3Good | 2Fair | 1Poor | NA |
| Excellent spacing of sutures (2-5mm) and consistent bites into submucosa |  | Occasional lapses in good spacing and depth of anastomotic sutures |  | Poor spacing and depth of anastomotic sutures |  |
| [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |

**Extent of Resection**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5Excellent | 4Very Good | 3Good | 2Fair | 1Poor | NA |
| Excellent understanding of resection margins and extent of lymph node excision |  | Fair understanding of margins and extent of nodal resection |  | Poorly understood resection margins and extent of nodal tissue excision |  |
| [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |

**Prevention of Contamination**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5Excellent | 4Very Good | 3Good | 2Fair | 1Poor | NA |
| Excellent understanding and utilization of measures to prevent intraperitoneal contamination |  | Aware of measures, but utilized somewhat inefficiently |  | Poor utilization of measures to prevent peritoneal contamination |  |
| [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |

**General Criteria**

**Instrument Handling**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5Excellent | 4Very Good | 3Good | 2Fair | 1Poor | NA |
| Fluid movements with instruments *consistently* using appropriate force, keeping tips in view, and placing clips securely |  | Competent use of instruments, *occasionally* appeared awkward or did not visualize instrument tips |  | Tentative or awkward movements, *often* did not visualize tips of instrument or clips poorly placed |  |
| [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |

**Respect for Tissue**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5Excellent | 4Very Good | 3Good | 2Fair | 1Poor | NA |
| *Consistently* handled tissue carefully (appropriately), minimal tissue damage |  | Careful tissue handling, *occasional* inadvertent damage |  | *Frequent* unnecessary tissue force or damage by inappropriate instrument use |  |
| [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |

**Time and Motion**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5Excellent | 4Very Good | 3Good | 2Fair | 1Poor | NA |
| Clear economy of motion, and maximum efficiency |  | Efficient time and motion, some unnecessary moves |  | Many unnecessary moves |  |
| [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |

**Operation Flow**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5Excellent | 4Very Good | 3Good | 2Fair | 1Poor | NA |
| Obviously planned course of operation and anticipation of next steps |  | Some forward planning, reasonable procedure progression |  | Frequent lack of forward progression; frequently stopped operating and seemed unsure of next move |  |
| [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |

**Overall Performance**

Rating of 4 or higher indicates technically proficient performance (i.e., resident is ready to perform operation independently, assuming resident consistently performs at this level)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5Excellent | 4Very Good | 3Good | 2Fair | 1Poor | NA |
| [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |

**Please indicate the weaknesses in this resident’s performance:**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Please indicate the strengths in this resident’s performance:**

|  |
| --- |
|  |